

REMARKS

Claim 7 has been amended to clarify a structural feature of the Applicant's apparatus. The specification has been amended to specify the structural limitations being added to claim 7. No new matter is being added because the added disclosure merely specifies what is clearly depicted in Figure 7 and what is inherent in the original disclosure.

In ¶ 3 of the action, claims 2, 3 and 6-9 were rejected as being anticipated by Schnyder (US 5,813,960). The Applicant traverses this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

The Schnyder patent discloses a jacket tube 2 that comprises an inner running tube 11, an intermediate support jacket 14 made of plastic, and an outer roll jacket 3 made of elastomer. The inner running tube 11 comprises a plurality of ring sections 12 made of metal and intermediate rings 13 made of resiliently deformable material. The Examiner states that items 13 are annular transverse cuts. This interpretation of rings 13 is incorrect. A ring is a three-dimensional structure; an annular transverse cut is a two-dimensional plane that separates two three-dimensional structures.

In any event, to remove all doubt, claim 7 has been amended to recite that respective pairs of adjacent transverse

annular cuts bound a respective ring section that is integrally formed with the uncut outer periphery of the tube, the ring sections being integrally formed with such outer periphery. This limitation clearly avoids the structure disclosed in Schnyder wherein each "cut" in the inner running tube 11 separates a metal ring section 12 from a ring 13 made of resiliently deformable material, and wherein each ring section 12 and each ring 13 is not integrally formed with the elastomeric outer periphery 14. Accordingly, the Applicant believes that the anticipation rejection based on Schnyder should be withdrawn.

In ¶ 5, claims 4, 5 and 10 were rejected as being unpatentable over Schnyder. The Applicant traverses this ground of rejection for the same reasons, set forth above, that claim 7 (on which claims 4, 5 and 10 depend) is not anticipated by Schnyder.


In ¶ 6, claim 11 was rejected as being unpatentable over Schnyder in view of Maddern et al. (US 5,589,258). The Applicant traverses this ground of rejection for the same reasons, set forth above, that claim 7 (on which claim 11 depends) is not anticipated by Schnyder.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and allowance of claims 2-11 and 14-21 are hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

April 12, 2007

Date


Dennis M. Flaherty
Reg. No. 31,159
Ostrager Chong Flaherty &
Broitman P.C.
570 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10022-6894
Tel. No.: 212-681-0600

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date set forth below.

April 12, 2007

Date


Dennis M. Flaherty